



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Amidst poverty, pain, and disease,
And other such matters as these,
We will swallow our pique and our pride
For a while and attempt to decide
The quarrel that led to the war—
Which might have been settled before
But for the old fable, grown hoary,
Of national honor and glory."

Ye statesmen, ye wise politicians,
Review, just for once, the conditions;
Is it thus that a sovereign state
Her honor must vindicate?

Degenerate Sons?

BY JOHN COLLINS.

Land of our fathers, who, with firm reliance
On Justice, Truth and Honor, pledged their name,
Shall we, as sons degenerate, fling defiance
On noble aims, and desecrate thy fame?

Shall love of conquest stain our starry banner,
As war's sad victims mark our new career,
Shall distant climes behold our foul dishonor
And henceforth view us with distrust and fear?

Shall we, though called perchance a Christian nation,
Assume a right that Providence ne'er gave,
To stir by menace or by provocation
Millions of men to warfare and a grave?

Can hostile deeds advance the sacred mission
Of Gospel truth in those benighted lands,
Or teach the savage tribes that their condition
Is best when firmly bound by war's red hands?

No! naught but peace can still the rage or terror
Of dusky warriors in those distant seas,
Or save our nation from its hasty error
To bind a people by its stern decrees.

Let not Columbia vainly strive for glory
Of arms victorious o'er a feeble foe,
Nor infamy defile, by conflict gory,
The record that a coming age may show.

He, who hath said, in words of proclamation,
"Vengeance is mine—I surely will repay,"
Shall yet be known in every land and nation
Where war and violence have held their sway.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letters to the Editor.

To the Editor of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

I have been looking over your last issue to-day and am glad to read that the people of Holland, Sweden, Norway and Denmark are unwilling to leave the acceptance of the Czar's excellent suggestions to their governments alone.

The above named powers are neutral, or rather we so think of them usually. They are *practically* neutral, as

is also Belgium, Portugal, Switzerland and Roumania, and as Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria should be.

Now if the government of Russia could make up its mind to renounce all intention of adding any further territory to the Czardom, and then place itself at the head of the neutral states, calling on Turkey and China to become such, also Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Italy, Roumania, Siam, Persia and Afghanistan, as well as Mexico and the leading South American republics, I think Russia could thus compel this country and England to give up all further aggressive efforts.

I cannot help but think that this is the right way out, the creation of a peaceful federation of neutral powers, and at the same time the practical disarmament of these by employing the army of each member of the Confederacy in railroad building or other industrial work, whilst not yet giving up the army organization.

I hope there may be some way of reaching the Czar, before the Disarmament Conference sits, with the fact that this country is not altogether in the hands of jingoes.

Respectfully,

B. F. LEEDS.

DORCHESTER, MASS., Feb. 9, 1899.

An Early Advocate of Peace.

BY DR. M. L. HOLBROOK.

Dr. Benjamin Rush, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, was often called the American Sydenham, also the father of American medicine. He was made Surgeon General in the war of the American Revolution, and became the most distinguished practitioner of his time. His essay on the cure of consumption by horseback riding is still excellent reading. He advocated a higher education for women, was opposed to capital punishment, objected to the administration of oaths on religious ground, and was explicit in his condemnation of the use of tobacco.

But it was not of these that I designed to speak, but of his project for universal peace. He proposed that there should be a Peace office and filled by one who should be the Secretary of State for Peace. This official, he proposed, should have control of all the free schools in every state, and his efforts and influence so far as possible were to be to subdue the passion for war, which education and human depravity have made universal by familiarity with instruments of death and by great military displays on so many occasions. Through his influence militia laws were to be repealed, military dress and titles laid aside, as well as all military reviews which tend to lend a charm to war by hiding its evils and its horrors. In this way Dr. Rush hoped that the spirit of vanity and hate which leads to war would die out, and that all questions of dispute between nations would be settled, as disputes between individuals are settled, in a reasonable manner, or by diplomacy or arbitration.

If this plan, even for schools, had been carried out, we should not have had, let us hope, as has just happened in a Military Convention, the president of a great University, President MacCracken, advocating military education in every school, and saying:

"If military drill were confined to those only from fourteen to eighteen years of age, we should have an army of 3,000,000 and over. The main question is, Shall at

least the 3,000,000 boys from fourteen to eighteen years of age have the opportunity of learning a little something of the rules and exercises that make men soldiers?", and after this statement adding: "Instruction in military tactics in public and private schools, so far as tried, has been eminently useful to the boys and to their teachers and the Nation, and, therefore, this convention should organize a propaganda to secure the extension of instruction in the high schools until, instead of less than 5 per cent. of the public high schools giving such instruction, there should not be 5 per cent. neglecting such instruction. Also, in the private high schools, so that, instead of less than 15 per cent. in any one of the five divisions of our country that give such instruction, there should be less than 15 per cent. not giving it. Second: In communities where no high schools exist and where boys are continued in the grammar or common schools until they are fifteen or sixteen years of age, this convention should encourage such schools to give military drill, such as is elsewhere given in high schools. Further: That grammar schools should be encouraged to introduce the various 'setting-up exercises', as a valuable and easily arranged gymnastic. Beyond this, as a rule, the grammar school should not attempt any military tactics."

Instead of this, let us adopt the plan of Benjamin Rush and banish all this thought of military drill from every school at once and forever.

America has had many men of whom it may justly be proud, but few of whom it should be more so than of Benjamin Rush.

NEW YORK CITY.

Broadening Patriotism.

BY R. W. H.

The passion called patriotism has ever been directed by what each community, according to circumstances, has marked as the limits of its country.

The earliest accounts of our race show a patriarchal government, where the family tie and the political tie were the same. But as civilization advanced and men, from being nomadic herdsmen, became cultivators of the soil, common interests united them into communities more extensive than that of the family.

Then, though the family interest bound them together, men began to term the communities so separated "countries", and to regard their interests with something of the affection which was formerly bestowed only on the family.

As material civilization advanced, the extent of territory included under single governments increased, but where this civilization was purely material, as among the great Asiatic nations, we do not find that the inhabitants had any very strong feelings on the subject of their nationalities.

Among the Greeks love of country and of countrymen was very intense; but unfortunately for the world, just when a few master minds were beginning to comprehend the unity and rights of at least the whole Hellenic race, material wealth, unaccompanied by true education, ruined the people, and allowed Philip of Macedon to plunge Greece back into barbaric greatness.

The Roman had not even as broad a principle as the Greek. Had a Roman been asked what was the country

whose interests he defended, he would have answered, "All that submits to Rome." The stranger was his enemy, and his enemy had no rights.

It was not until almost our own time that any nation began to recognize the principle which underlies a true conception of our country.

When England, at immense pecuniary sacrifice, abolished her own slave trade, and set her face against it all the world over, she was actuated by the principle that the most degraded have their rights.

In America, we have the broadest conception of a common country that the world has yet seen. Forty-five states, differing in many respects as widely as the European countries, have their foreign relations in common, and call any conflict among themselves civil war.

The Statesman, who would advance his state at the expense of the rest, would not be called a patriot. And the man who advances his country, though it be vast as the United States or should embrace every country of Europe, at the expense of the rest of the World, is not a true patriot. A man's country is the world. The patriot is the philanthropist. All war is civil war, and the only war for which any sort of justification can be offered is war against oppression.

It may be that the great commonwealth of the nations of the earth, which is looked forward to with so much interest, may be but a foreshadowing of a commonwealth of worlds. Then, freed from the bonds of the present material world, we may hope that our country may be boundless as the Universe and we may call every rational creature our countryman.

NEW YORK CITY.

Was the Civil War Necessary?

BY HENRY WOOD.

To speculate upon "What Might Have Been" usually seems to be a superfluous if not an unprofitable undertaking. That the philosophy which is embodied in the familiar aphorism, "Whatever is, is right", has some evolutionary significance and validity it is difficult to gainsay. It is also evident, even upon the surface, that to bewail the mistakes of the past in any pessimistic spirit is a mistake, for the world is coming, more and more, to recognize the usefulness and inspiration of optimism.

Even where there is no difference of opinion regarding its desirability, human progress toward a future ideal is rarely or never made by a direct course, but rather through devious by-ways, where friction is a constant attendant. The educational object-lessons, tests and trials of the race must be had, even at a dear rate, and there is at least one compensation in the fact that those which are expensive are thoroughly learned. It may even be admitted that an experience in evil has a kind of provisional utility, something like the dark background of a picture, where, through contrast, beauty becomes more strongly accentuated.

But there is another very practical side. The lessons of the past have great value in the determination of present duty and the use of future opportunity. While in itself history is a fixed quantity and cannot be undone, it may be invaluable as an interpreter. Said Patrick Henry in his notable speech: "I have but one lamp by